

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION**

Rashan Williams,

Plaintiff,

v.

Conn Appliances, Inc.,

Defendant.

:
: Civil Action No.: 4:16-cv-817
:

: **COMPLAINT**
: **JURY**
:
:
:

For this Complaint, Plaintiff, Rashan Williams, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

4:16-cv-817
JURISDICTION

1. This action arises out of Defendant's repeated violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227, *et seq.* (the "TCPA").
2. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that Defendant transacts business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

3. Plaintiff, Rashan Williams ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Houston, Texas, and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).
4. Defendant, Conn Appliances, Inc. ("Conn"), is a business entity located in The Woodlands, Texas, and is a "person" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

5. On or about August 6, 2015, Conn began calling Plaintiff's cellular telephone, number 832-XXX-1707, using an automatic telephone dialing system ("ATDS").

6. When Plaintiff answered calls from Conn, he heard silence before he was connected to a live representative.

7. In or around August 2015, Plaintiff requested that Conn stop calling his cellular telephone number.

8. Nevertheless, Conn continued to place automated calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone number.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE TCPA –
47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq.

9. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

10. At all times mentioned herein, Defendant called Plaintiff's cellular telephone number using an ATDS or predictive dialer.

11. In expanding on the prohibitions of the TCPA, the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") defines a predictive dialer as "a dialing system that automatically dials consumers' telephone numbers in a manner that "predicts" the time when a consumer will answer the phone and a [representative] will be available to take the call..."*2003 TCPA Order*, 18 FCC 36 Rcd 14022. The FCC explains that if a representative is not "free to take a call that has been placed by a predictive dialer, the consumer answers the phone only to hear 'dead air' or a dial tone, causing frustration." *Id.* In addition, the TCPA places prohibitions on companies that "abandon" calls by setting "the predictive dialers to ring for a very short period of time before disconnecting the call; in such cases, the predictive dialer does not record the call as having been abandoned." *Id.*

12. Defendant's telephone system(s) have some earmarks of a predictive dialer. When Plaintiff answered calls from Defendant, he heard silence before Defendant's telephone system would connect him to the next available representative.

13. Upon information and belief, Defendant's predictive dialers have the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator.

14. Defendant continued to place automated calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone number despite knowing it lacked consent to do so. As such, each call placed to Plaintiff was made in knowing and/or willful violation of the TCPA, and subject to treble damages pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

15. The telephone number called by Defendant was assigned to a cellular telephone service pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

16. The calls from Defendant to Plaintiff were not placed for "emergency purposes" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(i).

17. Plaintiff is entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages for each call made in negligent violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

18. Plaintiff is entitled to an award of treble damages in an amount up to \$1,500.00 for each call made in knowing and/or willful violation pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendant:

1. Statutory damages of \$500.00 for each violation determined to be negligent pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B);
2. Treble damages for each violation determined to be willful and/or knowing pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C); and

3. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: March 28, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Jenny DeFrancisco

Jenny DeFrancisco, Esq.
CT Bar No.: 432383
LEMBERG LAW LLC
A Connecticut Law Firm
43 Danbury Road
Wilton, CT 06897
Telephone: (203) 653-2250
Facsimile: (203) 653-3424